



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/597,239	06/20/2000	Kiyoshi Suzuki	PNDF-00040	5864
30743	7590	03/24/2004	EXAMINER	
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C. 11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 340 RESTON, VA 20190			KASSA, YOSEF	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2625	8	
DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/597,239	SUZUKI ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
YOSEF KASSA	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 January 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, (page 8-13) filed on 01/06/2004, with respect to claims 1-5 and 7-20 under Crane, Jr. et al (U.S. Patent 6,307,258) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Setlak et al (U.S. Patent 5,940,526).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crane, Jr. et al (U.S. Patent 6,307,258), and further in view of Setlak et al (U.S. Patent 5,940,526).

With regard to claim 1, Crane, Jr. discloses removing static electricity stored on a finger of a user prior to putting his finger on a fingerprint-reading portion (see col. 7, lines 40-45).

Crane, Jr. does not explicitly call for removing static electricity stored on a finger of a user while obtaining access to fingerprint reading portion. However, in the same field of endeavor Setlak et al (see col. 6, lines 32-47) teaches this feature. At the time of the invention was made, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Setlak et

al finger static removing process into Crane, Jr. system. The motivation for doing so is to bleeding a charge from a finger upon contact in fingerprint sensor.

With regard to claim 2, Crane, Jr. is silent about removing static electricity stored on finger of a user when cover is opened. However, this feature taught by Setlak et al (see col. 6, lines 32-47). At the time of the invention was made, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Setlak et al finger static removing process into Crane, Jr. system. The motivation for doing so is to bleeding a charge from a finger upon contact in fingerprint sensor.

With regard to claim 3, Crane, Jr. discloses forming cover by conductive material, connecting cover with a ground (see col. 4, lines 21-24). Crane, Jr. is silent about conducting static electricity to a ground via cover when cover is opened by finger of user. This feature taught by Setlak et al (see col. 6, lines 32-47). It would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Setlak et al finger static removing process into Crane, Jr. system.

With regard to claim 4, Crane, Jr. discloses providing a plate formed of conductive material for fingerprint-reading apparatus (see Fig. 2), connecting plate with a ground, and conducting static electricity stored on finger of user to ground via plate (see col. 4, lines 15-24). Crane, Jr. is silent about situating plate on a position on which user puts finger to open cover. This feature taught by Setlak et al (see col. 6, lines 32-47). It would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Setlak et al finger static removing process into Crane, Jr. system.

Claims 5 and 7 are similarly analyzed as claim 1 and 2.

With regard to claim 9, Crane, Jr. discloses conductive material is metal (see col. 7, lines 38-41).

Claim 10 is similarly analyzed as claims 1 and 2.

Claims 12, 15 and 18 are similarly analyzed as claim 9.

With regard to claim 20, Crane, Jr. conductive material is plastic containing carbon fibers therein (see col. 1, lines 62-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crane, Jr. (U.S. Patent 6,307,258) and Setlak (U.S. Patent 5,940,526), and further in view of Fujiwara et al (U.S. Patent 6,310,683).

With regard to claim 8, Crane, Jr. is silent about conductive material is conductive resin. The same field endeavor, Fujiwara teaches this feature (see col. 11, lines 20-26). At the time of the invention was made, it would have been obvious to incorporate a fingerprint reading apparatus as taught by Fujiwara in the system of Crane, Jr. because Fujiwara provides Crane, Jr. system a process of reducing an optical loss in reading a fingerprint, eliminating positioning among the respective components and improving the productivity.

Claims 11, 14 and 17 are similarly analyzed as claim 8.

Claim 13 is similarly analyzed as claims 1, 2 and 3. As to the additional limitation of a main cover which is provided with a display, this feature is taught by Fujiwara (see col. 3, lines 30-35).

Claims 16 and 19 are similarly analyzed as claim 13.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Other Prior Art Cited

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. (6,259,804) to Setlak et al discloses fingerprint sensor with gain control...

US Patent No. (6,069,970) to Salatino et al discloses fingerprint sensor and token reader and associated methods.

US Patent No. (6,088,585) to Schmitt et al discloses portable telecommunication device...

US Patent No. (6,098,330) to Schmitt et al discloses machine including vibration and shock resistant...

US Patent No. (6,180,989) to Bryant et al discloses selectively doped electrostatic discharge...

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YOSEF KASSA whose telephone number is (703) 306-5918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BHAVESH MEHTA can be reached on (703) 308-5246. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306 for regular communication and (703) 872-9306 for after Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631. The group receptionist number for TC 2600 is (703) 305-4700.

PATENT EXAMINER

Yosef Kassa
03/16/04.



BHAVESH M. MEHTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600